

Appendix A: The Planning Process

Setting the Stage

In 2000, the Director of the California Department of Parks and Recreation initiated a process involving nearly 300 key stakeholders and innovative thinkers at regional workshops and a Vision Summit to identify challenges and choices facing State Parks.¹ While this visioning process was intended for the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the outcomes set the stage for issue identification since the challenges mirror most of the issues facing all providers statewide.

The Process

The California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) initiated the statewide planning process in May of 2001. Planning began with the review of the *1993 California Outdoor Recreation Plan* and its implementation during the intervening eight-year period. DPR staff evaluated the various strengths and weaknesses of the previous plan to determine which elements were useful and which were not.

A literature review was conducted of issues affecting other states, consultation was held with other state and Federal agencies, contemporary issues from a variety of media sources were evaluated and a review of the issues identified in the *1993 California Outdoor Recreation Plan*, was used to develop a “long” list of issues. Understanding how the public perceives outdoor recreation resources in the state is also an important element in the issue identification process. Public attitudes and opinions toward outdoor recreation in California are identified through a statewide public opinion and attitudes survey.²

In preparation for the development of the California Outdoor Recreation Plan, in July 2001,

DPR entered into a contract with Moore, Iacofano, Goltsman, Inc. (MIG) to provide professional strategic planning guidance and to facilitate a workshop. MIG produced a brochure, *Californian’s Outdoors, On Our Way! Protecting our Gains; Planning for the Future*, which outlines the statewide master planning process.

California Department of Park and Recreation Director Rusty Areias brought together a group of key park and recreation professionals and community leaders to discuss how to create a Parks Movement, develop a statewide parks and recreation Master Plan, and identify a legislative agenda to support both efforts. During this same time frame, DPR appointed a Master Plan Advisory Committee, consisting of park and recreation professionals, to help guide the planning process.

In December 2001, the issues were presented to the newly established California Outdoor Recreation Master Plan Advisory Committee. The advisory committee helped with the identification of the issues and provided guidance on the “look” of how the plan should be presented. In summary they recommended that the plan should be fairly brief, contain measurable and achievable actions, identify actions that can be reasonably accomplished within a 5-year time frame and that can be assigned to a specific agency or agencies.

Department staff combined and consolidated the issues that were presented to the Master Plan Advisory Committee. Based on the recommendations and comments made by the Advisory Committee members, the process culminated in the development of six overarching issues to serve as the primary foundation from which remedies will be sought.

The process of identifying actions to address

the six overarching issues began in the spring of 2002 with a workshop at the California and Pacific Southwest Recreation and Park Training Conference. Over the course of the summer and on into the fall there were continual interactions with the Advisory Committee members, a day-long workshop for Southern California providers in Los Angeles, a presentation to the California Roundtable on Recreation, Parks, and Tourism, a presentation to the State Park and Recreation Commission, a workshop with the (CPRS) Administrators Institute, and regular mailings to park and recreation service providers throughout California soliciting their review, comments and suggested actions. A refined draft of the issues and recommended actions was placed on the DPR web site requesting public comment.

It should be noted that DPR views CORP planning as a process rather than the production of a single, all-encompassing document. In this manner, the California Outdoor Recreation Plan should be considered a compendium of elements or product deliverables, each of which have stand-alone value in their own right and which, when combined, become the Plan.

¹ *California State Parks. A Path to Our Future: Key Challenges & Choices*, May, 2000

² *California State Parks, Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California 1997*, March 1998

Appendix B: Master Plan Advisory Committee

The Master Plan Advisory Committee was appointed to assist the Department of Parks and Recreation with the identification of the issues affecting parks and recreation in California and in the development of meaningful actions that would address them. The issues and actions section serves as the core element of the California Outdoor Recreation Plan.

The Honorable Caryl Hart, Member
State Park and Recreation Commission

Bob Overstreet, Director
Sacramento City Parks

Robin Cox
The Nature Conservancy

Dr. Deborah J. Chavez, Research Social Scientist
Pacific Southwest Research Station

Patrick Tierney, Professor
San Francisco State University

Paul Slavick, OHV Coordinator
Honda Motorcycle Division

Joan Chaplick
Golden Gate National Parks Association

Kate Bickert, Director of Field Offices
Rails to Trails

John Poimiroo, President
John Poimiroo and Company

Paul Romero, Director
Santa Clara Valley Water Department

Tim Gallagher, Director
LA County Parks and Recreation

Chris Jarvi, Director
Anaheim Department of Community Services

Christine Nota, Regional Foresters Representative
US Forest Service

Meika Hamisch
California Coalition for Youth

Appendix C: Summary of the Open Project Selection Process for the Land and Water Conservation Fund

The California Department of Parks and Recreation has successfully administered the distribution of California's allocation of funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) since the program's inception in 1965. Under this program, part of the state's share of LWCF money is allocated to local government projects, and part goes to finance projects selected by four different state agencies.

Local government projects receiving LWCF money are selected by the State Department of Parks and Recreation from among a large number of applicants from throughout the state, using specific criteria and an Open Project Selection Process (OPSP). Each state agency, however, selects the projects on which to spend its share of LWCF money, using its own criteria based on the latest California Outdoor Recreation Plan (CORP) and its own selection process. All the criteria used to select any project, whether state or local, are designed to be responsive to public recreation activity preferences and the set of major issues facing park and recreation organizations in California, issues identified in CORP. The state is therefore able to demonstrate a consistent policy basis for the allocation of these funds.

State Agency Selection Process

Each of four agencies receives a legislatively determined portion of the state share of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. These agencies have quite different mandates and programs set forth by the legislature. As a result, these agencies have a high degree of freedom to select the projects for which their portion will be used. Such projects, however, must still directly address one or more of the major outdoor recreation issues identified in CORP.

The LWCF criteria used by each of the four state agencies are as follows:

1. **The California Department of Parks and Recreation** is the largest state agency recipient of LWCF money. A small amount, typically five percent, is allocated for state-wide planning, with the bulk being spent on the State Park System. The criteria used to select projects for the State Park System are designed to stimulate contributions from nonprofit organizations, and to facilitate acquisition projects for new units near urban centers, critical additions to existing parks, or in-holdings in established parks. These criteria also encourage rehabilitation of deteriorating and outmoded facilities and development of campsites, picnic sites, and other popular facilities in areas where demand is demonstrably high.
2. **The Wildlife Conservation Board** focuses its criteria on acquiring wildlife habitat—lands suitable for recreation and developing public access. Specifically, it stresses projects where local operations and maintenance funds are available or involve rehabilitation of existing structures, development near urban areas, and design for disabled users.
3. **The California Department of Boating and Waterways** uses economics as a dominant factor in consideration of its LWCF projects. A high benefit-to-cost ratio is a prominent criterion—buttressed by low-maintenance design and an expectation of high use. The Department also gives credit for facilities that are vandal proof, offer new or retrofitted access for the disabled, and provide better security for all users.

4. **The Department of Water Resources** uses its LWCF money for recreation components of the State Water Project. Generally, these facilities are extremely popular water-orientated attractions, and some are units of the State Park System. In general, LWCF money is used to provide better access and to protect existing areas and facilities.

Local Government Projects-Open Project Selection Process

The California Department of Parks and Recreation, through its Office of Grants and Local Services, selects local government projects to be funded each year. Using the established open selection process, cities, counties, and park and recreation districts apply to receive funding for projects in their jurisdiction. Because of the lengthy and complex process now required to revise any grant selection process in California, the OPSP will not be updated until the end of the 2003-04 fiscal year. Until then, the current OPSP identified in the 1993 CORP will continue to be used. Under the current OPSP, applications received from local government are evaluated using the procedure described below.

Projects submitted by local agencies are evaluated using two sets of criteria:

- ◆ Screening Criteria
- ◆ Ranking Criteria

The screening criteria determine whether a project is eligible:

- ◆ Does the project meet the eligibility requirements of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and the criteria established by the National Park Service?
- ◆ Is the project consistent with priority needs identified in the California Outdoor Recreation Plan?

- ◆ Is the application technically complete?
- ◆ Was it submitted by the deadline?
- ◆ Does the project have an assured source of eligible matching funds to meet the nonfederal share of the cost?
- ◆ Does the applicant have, by the deadline, adequate tenure to the land to be developed?

After a local project has been screened, it is evaluated by ranking criteria to assign a numerical rating. The ranking criteria have a number of components:

1. The extent to which the project meets the priority statewide outdoor recreation needs identified in the current outdoor recreation plan, including:
 - ◆ Recreation activities. The DPR statewide opinion survey determined the latent demand for outdoor recreation activities. It resulted in a priority statewide ranking of activities.
 - ◆ Support facilities. Restrooms, parking areas, entrance stations, maintenance areas, and fencing needed to improve the quality of the recreation experience, or to make the project available for visitation, will be considered for funding.
2. The local need for the project balances California's great diversity in climate, landscape, population distribution, density, and jurisdictional stages of development by allowing projects to be compared against one another using criteria that can be objectively applied:
 - ◆ Does the project appear on an agency-wide master plan?
 - ◆ Does the project appear on an approved site plan?

- ◆ Is there a lack of similar opportunities within the area served by the project?
- ◆ Will the project be accessible to special populations?
- ◆ What is the population and density within the service area of the park?
- ◆ Is there demonstrated public involvement in the proposed project selection and planning process?

3. Project-specific criteria compare projects by evaluating a number of site-specific factors:

- ◆ Cost/benefit ratio.
- ◆ Accessibility of site.
- ◆ For acquisition only:
 - Urgency of acquisition.
 - Acquisition of wetlands/open space in urban areas.
- ◆ For development only:
 - Least alteration of site.
 - Type of development (rehabilitation versus new and additions).

4. Applicant criteria compare projects by assessing the applicant's effectiveness and timely administration of previously awarded grant funds, and stewardship of existing facilities:

- ◆ Administration of previously awarded grants.
- ◆ Ability to operate and maintain the project.

5. Bonus points are awarded for applications that are technically complete by the annual deadline.

6. Finally, if projects are tied after being ranked,

the following tie-breaking criteria are used to judge the projects:

- ◆ Geographical distribution.
- ◆ Applicant with the least recent LWCF grants.
- ◆ Project's overall merit.

The final numerical ranking of an eligible grant request is calculated by combining all the criteria points. Projects are then recommended for funding in the order of their assigned score until the funds allocated for local projects are exhausted.

Although there are differences among the criteria used by each of the state agencies involved in this program and differences between the criteria used by state agencies as a group and those local agencies, there is a strong common thread among them. All of these criteria are designed to respond to the major issues identified in the CORP. The resulting projects offer the public a tremendous variety from which to choose, offering a healthy diversity while meeting significant needs in their specific areas.

